

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Official Action dated September 22, 2011, for the above identified patent application.

At page 2, paragraph 1 of the Official Action, claims 1-4 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being obvious over the newly applied Trent et al patent (U.S. Patent No. 7,212,098) and the previously applied Lacombe et al patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,689).

At page 5, paragraph 2 of the Official Action, claims 5-10 and 12-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being obvious over a combination of the Trent et al and Lacombe et al patents, in further view of the previously applied Kniffin et al patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,991).

Claim 1 is the only independent claim pending in this patent application. For the purpose of simplifying the issues, the prior art rejection of the claims will be argued only with respect to independent claim 1. If this claim is allowed, the remaining rejected dependent claims will be allowable, at least for the same reasons as parent independent claim 1.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the nature of the claimed invention, and to further distinguish the claim over the applied prior art references.

More specifically, independent claim 1 now expressly recites that the second stationarily disposed key is fixedly and permanently mounted to a portion of a structure at a predetermined location in which the container is to be opened. This feature of the invention is supported by the original disclosure, at, for example, the last two paragraphs of the third page of the original Specification which states the following:

“Fig. 1 illustrates in larger scale a stationary second key 20 that includes a capsule in the form of, for instance, a circular outer casing 21 which is equipped with an alarm system which will cause all types of unauthorised action on the casing 21, such as attempt to make holes in the casing or attempts to open the casing, to be indicated. Arranged in the outer casing 21 is a third electronic unit 22. Any attempt to make a hole in the casing 21 or any attempt to open the casing will result in destruction of the coding of key 20.

The outer casing 21 may be comprised of hardened steel or some other not readily forced material. The illustrated capsule or casing 21 has an outer circular shape and includes an end wall 23, a barrel surface 24 and a circular connection flange 25. The casing 21 that protects the electronic unit 22 is firmly attached to a permanent part 60 of the building where it will be used. The attachment can e.g. be achieved by means of a strong center screw 26 and additional screws 27 through the flange 25. An attempt to remove the key 20 from the mounting structure 60 can be indicated so that an attempt to remove the stationary or wall-mounted key 20 will result in the destruction of the coding of said key.”

Thus, it is apparent from the aforementioned portion of the original Specification, and Figure 1 of the original drawing, that the second key, including a portion of the full code-set for deactivating an alarm when opening the container, is fixedly and permanently mounted to a portion of a structure at a predetermined location in which the container is to be opened.

In the Official Action, the Trent et al patent has been applied as illustrating a “stationary computer (101)” which is “fixedly mounted... within a desired location such as a

bank (i.e. a predetermined location) in which the container (110) is to be opened...".

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the Trent et al patent.

The Trent et al patent discloses a first host computer designated by reference numeral 100 which communicates with a second local computer designated by reference numeral 101. The Trent et al Specification states, in pertinent part:

"Turning now to Figs. 3 through 8, communication between host computer 100 and controller 120, or alternatively, a local computer 100 or a computer 101 sited at a remote location to which the container 110 has been transported, may be conducted in various modalities,..." [Trent et al Specification, column 5, lines 31-35].

The Official Action states that the computer 101 at the remote location to which the computer has been transported, corresponds to the second key (20), disclosed by Applicant and expressly recited in independent claim 1. However, there is no disclosure whatsoever in the Trent et al Specification that the computer 101 is "fixedly" mounted at a predetermined location in which the computer is to be opened, or, as presently recited in independent claim 1, that the computer 101 is fixedly and permanently mounted to a portion of a structure at a predetermined location in which the computer is to be opened.

Contrary to the interpretation of the Trent et al patent made in the Official Action, the computer 101 is a conventional desktop computer (See Figure 3 of the Trent et al drawing), which can clearly be removed or moved from the location to which the container is transported. It is not fixedly and permanently mounted to a portion of a structure of the

predetermined location to which the container is transported to be opened, as disclosed by Applicant and as expressly recited in independent claim 1.

The difference between the disclosure of the Trent et al patent and the invention disclosed and claimed by Applicant, is underscored by comparing Figure 1 of Applicant's drawing with Figure 3 of the Trent et al drawing. While Figure 3 of the Trent et al drawing illustrates a conventional desktop computer 101 alone, Figure 1 of Applicant's drawing illustrates that the second, stationary key 20 is fixedly and permanently mounted to a wall at a predetermined location where the container is to be opened, and an alarm means preventing removal of the second key (20) from the wall to which it is fixedly and permanently mounted.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is clearly no teaching or suggestion in the Trent et al patent that the conventional desktop computer 101 situated at the location to which a container is transported, is fixedly and permanently mounted to a structure at that location.

The Lacombe et al patent, which has been combined with the Trent et al patent to reject independent claim 1, has been cited as illustrating an alarm system. It has not been cited as illustrating a stationary second key fixedly and permanently mounted to a portion of a structure at a predetermined location in which the container is to be opened.

Accordingly, a combination of the Trent et al and Lacombe et al patents cannot result in a process defined by independent claim 1, or any obvious variation thereof, since neither the Trent et al or Lacombe et al patents teaches or suggests a significant feature of independent claim 1, as expressly recited in independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. The remaining rejected dependent claims, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and include all features of that claim, are allowable, at least for the same reasons as parent independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that this patent application is in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The present Amendment is accompanied by a petition to extend the time for responding to the outstanding Official Action for two months, and the required fee for the requested extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark P. Stone', is written over the typed name.

Mark P. Stone
Registration No. 27,954
Attorney for Applicant
400 Columbus Avenue
Valhalla, NY 10595
(914) 769-1106